



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ed.—P. 320. *Savanna* is not from the Greek through Lat. and Span. (cf. pp. 337, 341 for Skeat's whole view), cf. the accent of the Span. word and its meaning, see Littré., s. v. *savane* (in the *Supplément*) where, however, a correction for reference to the edition of Las Casas, 'Historia de las Indias,' now in print, Madrid, 1875-76, is called for; it is in Book 1, chap. 91 or vol. ii, p. 35 that the passage occurs: "al pié del asiento de esta fortaleza está un llano gracioso, que los indios llaman çabana." I may also mention as of possible value in this connection an article in the New York *Nation*, 1885, vol. xl, p. 508. There is a Span. *sabana*, accented on the second syllable, which does correspond to our word, and is this *çabana* in modern spelling. *Paragon* (same page) is spoken of as from Span., while on p. 335 we see that Tobler's etymology is known to Skeat, and is spoken of as the probable solution. It should have been added, therefore, that Tobler does not derive Span. *paragon*, *parangon* immediately from Greek, but thinks the word was brought from Italy into Spain. Skeat's quotation from Minsheu (1623) does not prove that our word came immediately from Span.; it may have come from French which also had the word in the sixteenth century; it was in use in English before 1623.—P. 321. Interesting are the remarks on *garble* with the correction of Godefroy. I have already mentioned some statements about Span. pronunciation; there are also inconsistencies; cf. what is said of the sounds of *z* and *c*, p. 323, §226 (*z* pronounced as *s* is apparently considered the Spanish pronunciation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), p. 333 ("ç=ts?" and the remarks on Eng. *lasso*), and p. 436, where we read: "but it seems clear that in the sixteenth century, Span. *ç* and *z* both had the sound of *z* in *zone*." And in the same sentence, further on, is added: "that *ll* had the modern Italian, not the modern Spanish sound; and that *x* had the old sound of E[ng]. *x* in *mix*, though it, probably, soon passed into *sh*." The idea of different dialect developments of older *ç* and *z* might naturally have suggested itself to explain cases like *lasso*, but no such idea seems to have occurred to the author. No comment is needed on the last words quoted.

There is much that is good in this book, and the main cause for regret is that more time was not given to its preparation, so as to make it, as it might have been made, very much better. As it is, it at least contains a large number of examples, and will show the great importance of the French element in our language, and future writers on that subject will be likely to utilize much of its material, while it may be doubted whether they will have such a knowledge of Middle English as Skeat.

I have never studied any work from his hand without profit, and if in the present case the profit has been less than I had hoped, the reason is that the work was done in a field where he is not quite at home.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph.D., Litt. D., Professor of English in the College of New Jersey. Funk & Wagnall's Company, New York: 1892, 8vo, 384 pp.

THE aim of Dr. Hunt's book is to counteract the chilling and repressive influence of the dominant, materialistic philosophy, as speculative and unethical, upon the poetic instincts. "If English literature comes more and more into union with modern materialism its doom is sealed." He finds "the precedent of the present tendency in the period when English Deism was at its height and the speculative reason usurped the place of simple faith."

There is no abstract discussion of the relation of morality to literature, but in the course of his historic review he shows, as they arise, that the best literary products of the English mind are ethical. The dependence of literature upon its moral contents and spirit for its power, dignity, and æsthetic value is assumed. Dewey is quoted: "no poetry can be good, even in an æsthetic sense, which is divorced from the moral principle."

He seeks to counteract the enfeebling influence of the materialistic philosophy upon English literature in particular, by showing that the constitutional bias of the mind of the English race received from *the ethical teachings*

of its first and formative period, when "the moral element is ever visible," is ethical. Its highest artistic results, in agreement with Taine's theory of art, is in the line of its own constitutional bias and spirit. The English mind will work more genially and powerfully, and achieve its highest and purest literary triumphs when it works in a moral spirit and upon moral truth.

It is not necessary for Dr. Hunt, therefore, to review the literature from the Reformation and the age of Elizabeth to show that it is distinctively ethical, with the solitary exception of the literature of the Restoration, the exceptional character of which disappears in view of the literary strength of the minority.

He limits his review to the period from Beowulf to Ascham as the first and *formative* period. He shows in a succession of most interesting chapters that, during this period, the English mind was under Christian culture, evangelical, independent, and protesting. "From the days of Cædmon to the Norman Conquest, and still on to the time of Chaucer and Caxton, most of the best prose and poetry was ethical, if not, indeed, distinctly religious in character." In regard to Beowulf, Dr. Hunt claims that the general cast of the poem is ethical. "It is more than that, and may be said to be profoundly serious and earnest." "There are tendencies and teachings far from unchristian, and which go far to establish a basis on which positively Christian doctrine may be founded." "Most of the ethical element is undoubtedly due to the Anglo-Danish paraphrast."

In distinct chapters, he reviews the Bible and Homily in Old English, Cædmon's, Bede's, Alfred's, Cynewulf's, Layamon's, Orm's, Richard de Bury's, and Richard Rolle's writings, the teachings of the School, and the church, and Old English laws and proverbs. These chapters form the First Part, in which he makes it clearly evident, as was done by Soames in his labors in this field, that the ethical teachings of the Anglo-Saxon church were evangelical, independent and protesting. Dr. Hunt refers this, in large degree, to the influence of the native British church, but allows that "the missionary movements from Rome became fully established ere departures, more

or less important, from the earliest type of the Latin church began to be manifest." Whether due to the British church or to the character of the comparatively pure Christianity of the first Roman missionaries, Anglo-Saxon Christianity maintained throughout its entire period a character quite distinct and peculiar. As has been said by an eminent authority, "of all the literatures of modern Europe, the English felt the influence of Christianity in its purest form."

In a Second Part, Dr. Hunt reviews the literature from Chaucer to Ascham, in chapters on Chaucer, the 'Cursor Mundi,' the Stage, Mandeville, Wiclif, Langland, Gower, Caxton, Latimer, Tyndale, and Ascham, with concluding chapters of great interest upon the English Bible and the English language.

It is necessary for the force of his argument that Dr. Hunt should show that the continuity of English literature was not broken by the Conquest. Here, as in his history of English prose, he maintains the continuity with great and convincing earnestness. He exhibits the transmission of these teachings, not only through tradition, but through literature, in Layamon, and Orm, and Rolle. Though much of the literature of this transitional period is translation from the French, it is the translation of the ethical writings of the French, in the ethical spirit of the English. Dr. Hunt has rescued the literature of this period from the contempt it has received as only valuable for philological uses. He does not claim for the literature of the period preceding the age of Elizabeth an artistic form. The English mind was too deeply concerned with the spirit and stuff of literature to give attention to fine form. The historic order in the development of the true, the good, and the beautiful in English literature followed the logical order. As Shedd says:

"The same degree of careful effort devoted to the artistic and formal finish of a work AFTER, instead of before, the proper diligence and care have been devoted to its material origination within the mind, will elaborate it into a high beauty and an exquisite grace, that are absolutely beyond the power of one who has not thus begun at the beginning."

This applies to the common as truly as to the individual mind. The ethical English

mind in its maturity, and in the "fulness of times," under classical influence expressed itself in the finest form.

Dr. Hunt's claim of a high ethical character for Chaucer will, perhaps, be rejected by some. Arnold deposes him from his literary position for his alleged want of seriousness. Lounsbury, in his "Studies in Chaucer," presents his views in the following abstracts: "The evidence indicates that Chaucer's mind passed through several phases, but that towards the end doubt and denial became its leading characteristics." He concedes that "the evidence is scanty" but insists that "it is equally fair to say that it cannot be expected to be otherwise than scanty." Lounsbury finds in Chaucer "an audaciousness in his reference to the Supreme Being," shocking to the devout, and "a familiarity of tone coming perilously near to the verge of blasphemy." Yet he recognizes the fact "that he was profoundly interested in the questions connected with doctrinal theology. The problems which still disquiet the intellect, and after the solution of which we grope in vain in the soul's own darkness, were the ones that were perpetually present to his mind." This seems like a concession to an ethical element in Chaucer.

Dr. Hunt has effectively shown that in each of the eras reviewed in the two parts into which his work is divided,

"a distinctive and an ever-increasing Christian element is visible; so prominent, at times, as to control the current speech, and never so in abeyance as to be without decided potency. So manifest, indeed, is this to the discerning student of our oldest literature that it is not unhistorical to say that Old English, taken as a whole, is more biblical and ethical in its tone than it is secular, and might be assigned, as to much of it, to the alcoves of theology and morals, of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology."

Dr. Hunt's work thus becomes a valuable contribution to the philosophy of English literature. He has shown in the ethical teachings of the earliest period the influence of the agencies in the formation of the established bias and spirit of the English mind, and the essential characteristic of English literature, which has made it "the most thoughtful, the most vigorous, and the most vitalizing literature of the modern world."

He refers this characteristic not to the "soil, sea, sky, and climate" of England, to which Taine so largely refers it, but, recognizing these material conditions as predisposing influences, he refers the ethical character to the providential and historic tuition of its formative period. This serves as a strong justification of the attention given to the earlier literature in English studies. The student drinks at the fountain head from the source of the power and dignity of our great literature.

CHARLES E. HART.

Rutgers College.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

Studier over engelske Kasus. I Række. Med en Indledning: Fremskridt i Sproget. Af OTTO JESPERSEN, Copenhagen: Kleins Forlag, 1891. Pp. 222.

DR. JESPERSEN'S first series of studies of the English case is one of the most careful pieces of work in this direction yet produced in Danish. The author has collected a vast amount of material from the earliest to the latest period of the language, showing an intimate knowledge of our tongue that is very rare in a foreigner. His first independent work was an English grammar, published in 1885, since which time he has brought out a number of monographs on various linguistic subjects. Valuable as the treatment of the English case is, however, the chief interest of the work undoubtedly centers in the introduction, "Progress in Language," which forms more than a quarter of the whole, and in which the author attempts to prove the grammatical superiority of modern English over Old English, of analytical languages over synthetic, of root languages over inflectional. In connection with this theory, or, perhaps, as a logical consequence of it, he undertakes also to overthrow the theory that the inflectional, agglutinative and root families of languages represent three stages of development, of which the last is the most primitive.

To take up the first question, the superiority of modern English to old English as a means of communication. While the author is perfectly correct in his statement that speech is the effort to make one's meaning intelligible and that, therefore, "that language stands